

REMARKS

By the present Amendment, claims 1-16 are cancelled and claims 17-31 are added. This leaves claims 17-31 pending in the application, with claim 17 being independent.

Substitute Specification

The specification is revised to avoid the objections raised in the Office Action and to eliminate grammatical and idiomatic errors in the originally presented specification. The number and nature of the changes made in the specification would render it difficult to consider the case and to arrange the papers for printing or copying. Thus, the substitute specification will facilitate processing of the application. The substitute specification includes no “new matter”. Pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 608.01(q), voluntarily filed, substitute specifications under these circumstances should normally be accepted. A marked-up copy of the original specification is appended hereto.

Drawings

The originally filed drawings are objected to for allegedly using “11” in Fig. 3 to designate two different parts, and failing to show “20” mentioned in original claim 15. The replacement drawings avoid the objection to Fig. 3 by identifying the increased sized roll with “11a”. The number “20” is not used in the pending claims. Additionally, Fig. 1 is modified to more clearly show the connection of port 41 to space 3, of connection 47 to space 9 and of connection 49 to space 3.

Thus, the drawings are now formal.

Information Disclosure Statement

Submitted herewith are a listing of the patents referenced in the specification and copies of those patents. The Examiner is requested to make these patents of record in this application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Original claims 1-16 stand objected to as being informal and/or rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. By the present Amendment, the originally filed claims have been rewritten to avoid the language alleged to be informal or indefinite in the Office Action. All language of the presently pending claims is now believed to be formal and definite. Thus, the pending claims are definite and comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

New claim 17 combines the limitations of original claims 1 and 2, avoids the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, and constitutes original claim 2 written in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Since such claim is indicated as being allowable, independent claim 17 and dependent claims 18-31 should be allowable. The remarks will not be burdened with a comparison of the pending claims and the cited patents.

In view of the foregoing, claims 17-31 are allowable. Prompt and favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark S. Bicks
Reg. No. 28,770

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, LLP
1300 19th Street, NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 659-9076

Dated: December 28, 2007